Mr. BAKER of California. The correct answer is when Jimmy Carter left there was $1 trillion worth of national debt and now there are $4 trillion, but your point is well taken.

Pick the President you like the least. Over the last 26 years we have had how many Presidents? Seven. So I would pick out Jimmy Carter who was playing on the tennis court, and you would pick Ronald Reagan who you say would sleep through all the Cabinet meetings. Then you take Bill Clinton who despite all the rhetoric on cutting the budget is going to add a trillion dollars. Pick the President you want.

Mr. OWENS. What amount of debt was accumulated under each President?

Mr. BAKER of California. Pick the President you want. This Congress for 40 years has had its foot stuck on the accelerator. We appropriate, we spend. Heal thyself.

THE TIME IS NOT RIGHT FOR TAX CUTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BILBRAY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DOYLE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I was born and raised in, and now represent western Pennsylvania and I can tell you that in our region we remember the 1980's very well—we remember the huge tax cuts that were enacted under the guise of stimulating the economy, under the guise of increasing revenues, but the corresponding spending cuts needed to keep the budget under control never took place. What happened? In western Pennsylvania we watched as the Federal budget deficit quadrupled from 1 trillion to over 4 trillion and brought on an economic downturn from which we have not recovered. Now we see that the new Republican majority in Congress wants to do it all again—enact huge tax cuts before we make the necessary cuts in spending. It sounds like the same mistakes made in the 1980's are coming back again in the 1990's.

The Republicans want to enact a bill of massive tax cuts that they claim is designed to help the middle-class. Let it be perfectly clear that this is one Member who believes the best way to help the middle-class, and everyone else for that matter, is to reduce our monstrous Federal debt. Since we are just beginning to make some progress in this area, I do not believe it is the right time for any tax cuts and I am confident that most of the country and the people in my district would agree that we must stay focused on reducing the deficit rather than exacerbating the problem by enacting tax cuts that we cannot afford.

Still, when we actually examine this Republican plan, my opposition to it grows even stronger because there is no question in my mind that these proposed tax cuts will in truth, benefit the wealthiest Americans at the expense of the middle and lower classes! A Treasury Department study has shown that the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans will derive 20 percent of the benefits under this bill. In fact, over half—51.5 percent—of the tax benefits derived under the Republican proposal will go to benefit families with annual incomes over $100,000. This is plainly and simply—an outrage.

Adding insult to this injury, the Republicans have made their ''tax credit for families with children'' nonrefundable. This means only wealthy families will be able to take full advantage of the credit while low and middle-income Americans lose out again. I heard one of my friends on the other side of the aisle say that the Contract With America wanted to make a statement that children have value, but with this provision, a family of three with one child, earning $15,000 a year would get a $90 credit, not $500. A family of five including three children, earning $22,000 a year would get $375 not $1500. I guess under the contract, a child's value is determined by the wealth of his or her parents.

As I said before, I do not believe the time is right for tax cuts of any kind—but for the Republicans to propose a plan designed to help those who need it least while it hurts those who most need help is not only foolhardy—its reprehensible.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this proposal, and I yield back the balance of my time.

PRO-SENIOR TAX PROVISIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to highlight a number of pro-senior provisions which are contained in the Tax Fairness and Deficit Reduction Act. H.R. 1327 not only reduces the tax burden on American families, it repeals the Clinton tax increase in Social Security, raises the Social Security earnings test limit, and provides tax incentives for the purchase of long-term care insurance.

The failed notion that Government knows best how to spend people's money has given us a Government that is too big, taxes that are too high, and a huge debt to lay at the feet of our children. The American people have subscribed to a new idea of government—that people and not bureaucrats know best how to spend and invest money. They have sent a clear message that they do not want Government policies that over-burden the taxpayer while encouraging dependence on Government support.

These provisions are in line with the philosophy of smaller government and fewer taxes. At the same time, the bill is distinctly pro-senior. First, the bill would repeal the tax increase imposed by President Clinton's tax package of 1993. It would provide needed relief to seniors on fixed incomes, whom the administration labels as ''wealthy.'' Senior citizens with incomes of more than $34,000 a year are not rich. Seniors face escalating costs for housing, medical care, and prescription drugs and the Clinton tax increase made it even more difficult for many seniors to fend for themselves.

The repeal of this provision is also important because it scales back a very dangerous precedent. The Clinton tax on Social Security actually transferred money away from the Social Security trust fund. Revenue raised from the increased taxation on Social Security benefits is not returned to the Social Security Trust fund. We heard lots of talk from opponents of the balanced budget amendment that Republicans were going to raid Social Security, but ironically, it is President Clinton who has set the standard for raiding the trust fund.

The Tax Fairness and Deficit Reduction Act will also raise the Social Security earnings test limit. The earnings test is a penalty imposed on seniors—our most valuable and experienced resource in the work force—who choose to continue working after they turn 65. Social Security recipients earning more than the current limit of $11,280, will have $1 of benefits reduced for every $3 over the limit. That means that low to middle income seniors will face marginal tax rates of 55.65 percent—when you consider the 15 percent Federal income tax and 7.65 for FICA. That is unfair and discriminatory policy that will end under H.R. 1327.

The current earnings test sends a clear message to seniors: Do not work. It will not pay, which is not the message we should be sending.

Finally, this legislation encourages the purchase of long-term care insurance. Too often, senior citizens who have exhausted their resources or rely solely on Social Security as a primary source of income—perhaps because the earnings test discouraged them from continuing to work—must spend down their resources to become eligible for long-term care under the Medicaid program. There must be a better way, and I believe encouraging the purchase of long-term care insurance will allow more seniors to keep their assets and independence from Government support.

Mr. Speaker, these three provisions will greatly benefit seniors, and at the same time encourage self-reliance. I look forward to having the opportunity to support these changes when we consider H.R. 1327 on the House floor this week.

THE REPUBLICAN TAX CUT IS IRRESPONSIBLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GENE GREEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.